

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 and 34-38 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 7-15, 17 and 20-28 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected Species. Rejoinder of the withdrawn claims is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 29-33 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, claims 1-3 are amended to correct antecedence, and claims 34-38 are added. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19 and 32 contain allowable subject matter. However, Applicants assert that claims 1 and 16 are also allowable for the reasons discussed below.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 16, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,585,884 to Onuki. This rejection is rendered moot with respect to claims 29 and 30, and is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims 1 and 16.

Onuki does not teach or suggest an image blur correction camera, comprising a photographing optical system; an image-capturing element that captures a subject image through the photographing optical system; a vibration detection section that detects camera vibration; a blur correction device that corrects blur of the image captured by the image-capturing element according to detection results of the vibration detection section; an ocular viewfinder for observing the subject with one's eyes in close contact; a non-ocular viewfinder for observing the subject with one's eyes at a distance; a used viewfinder determination section that determines which of the ocular viewfinder and the non-ocular viewfinder is being used; and a blur correction operation changing section that changes operation of the blur correction device according to determination results of the used viewfinder determination section, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Onuki fails to teach or suggest an image blur correction camera, comprising an image-capturing element that captures a subject image through a photographing optical system; a vibration detection section that detects vibration of the camera; a blur correction signal output section that outputs blur correction signals to a blur correction device that carries out blur correction of the image formed by the image-capturing element according to detection results from the vibration detection section; an ocular viewfinder for observing the subject with one's eyes in close contact; a non-ocular viewfinder for observing the subject with one's eyes at a distance; a used viewfinder determination section that determines which of the ocular viewfinder and the non-ocular viewfinder is being used; and a blur correction operation changing section that controls the blur correction signal output section so as to output the signals for changing operation of the blur correction device depending on determination results of from the used viewfinder determination section, as recited in claim 16.

Instead, Onuki discloses a camera with image blur correction. In particular, Onuki teaches a camera body 1 with a film plane 2 that receives an image through a focus lens 4, a magnification change lens 5 and a blur correction system 6. A velocity meter 22 detects vibration, from which an integrator 24 determines displacement to compensate for motion blur by a driver circuit 25 for correction actuators 26. An infrared emitting diode (IRED) 34 illuminates a photographer's pupil for a detection sensor 33 to determine a sight axis (col. 3, lines 25-63, col. 4, lines 1-39 and Fig. 1 of Onuki).

Applicants respectfully assert that Onuki fails to teach or suggest the combination of ocular and non-ocular viewfinders. By such absence, Onuki further fails to teach or suggest any device to determine which viewfinder is being used, or any device that controls the blur correction signal based on which viewfinder is determined. Consequently, Onuki does not teach or suggest all of Applicants' recited features in claims 1 and 16.

A claim must be literally disclosed for a proper rejection under §102. This requirement is satisfied “only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference” (MPEP §2131).

Applicants assert that the Office Action fails to satisfy this requirement with Onuki.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over the applied reference. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that newly added claims 34-38 are also patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Gerhard W. Thielman
Registration No. 43,186

MAC:GWT/gwt

Date: September 19, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--